

7-1976

Student Psychological Variables & the Relationship of Student Perception of Teachers

Karen Wolfe

Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wolfe, Karen, "Student Psychological Variables & the Relationship of Student Perception of Teachers" (1976). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 3010.

<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/3010>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

Wolfe,
Karen Lynne

1976

STUDENT PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES AND THE RELATIONSHIP
OF STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Karen Lynne Wolfe

July, 1976

STUDENT PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES AND THE RELATIONSHIP
OF STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS

APPROVED 7-16-76 :
(date)

Carl R. Martney
Director of Thesis

Ronald W. Adams

James H. Gray

Elmer Gray 7-20-76
Dean of the Graduate School

Acknowledgments

I wish to commend the members of my committee, Dr. Ron Adams, Dr. Jim Craig and Dr. Carl Martray, for their guidance and exemplary cooperation with myself and with each other throughout this project. To my chairman, Dr. Martray, I owe special gratitude for his steadfast support and encouragement during the 18 months which transpired between the conception of the original idea and the finished product.

I wish to thank Ms. Eula Euwing Monroe from whose concern and interest in her students and her work this project was born. She also voluntarily made a thorough literature search after my own to make certain all pertinent resources at our disposal had been identified.

Cheryl Bateman, Ed Turner and Carl Martray deserve credit for their voluntary work as test administrators. Kassie Meyers and Paula Gibbs were also generous in that they spent many laboring hours helping to score the instruments.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the love, help and encouragement of my parents, Marcia and Marvin Wolfe, during the past year of our growing together. To my brother, Mark, I owe special thanks for a lesson which he has taught me. When the going gets rough, when the mind is cluttered with a thousand possibilities, take

a day off for fishing far away from the crowd. Many things
can be easily decided on the bank of a river.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	vii
Chapter I Introduction	1
Chapter II Review of Related Literature	6
Student Evaluation of Teachers and Student	
Attainment	6
Reliability and Validity of Student Evaluation of	
Teachers	9
Teacher Characteristics Desired by Students	12
Student Characteristics	15
Summary of the Literature Review	27
Chapter III Method	31
Chapter IV Results	41
Chapter V Conclusion and Implications	46
Implications	48
References	51
Appendix	59

List of Tables

	Page
Table I	43
Table II	44

STUDENT PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES AND THE RELATIONSHIP
OF STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS

Karen L. Wolfe

July, 1976

62 pages

Directed by: Carl Martray, Ron Adams and James Craig

Department of Psychology

Western Kentucky University

A set of six student psychological variables-- internal locus of control for positive and negative events as assessed by the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire; self esteem as assessed by the Self Esteem Inventory; and level of regard, empathetic understanding, unconditionality of regard and congruence as assessed by the Relationship Inventory--were correlated with a set of four student perception of teacher variables--interactional competence, rapport, unreasonable negativity and fosterance of self esteem as assessed by the Student Evaluation of Teacher II--to determine the relationship between the student psychological variables and the manner in which students evaluate their teachers. The subjects, sixth graders from ten classrooms in South Central Kentucky, were administered the instruments in two days of testing, all of which occurred in April, 1976. Using canonical correlation, it was found that three student psychological variables-- level of regard, self esteem and empathetic understanding-- contributed highly to the prediction of student perception of teachers, level of regard and empathetic understanding

being highly related. Three student perception of teacher variables--fosterance of self esteem, rapport and unreasonable negativity--contributed highly to the prediction of student psychological variable scores. It was concluded that sixth grade students of varying academic ability exhibited the same pattern of evaluating their teachers and that their own self esteem, perception of their teachers' level of regard and empathetic understanding strongly influence their perception of their teachers. It was further suggested that student perception of teachers may really be a reflection of student perception of the Institution of Education and student perception of self in relation to that Institution.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

"Those characteristics which impress pupils favorably, which lead to high appreciation on their part, and which establish those relations of sympathy and cooperation so essential in the schoolroom, must have some value" (Kratz, 1896, p. 413). It is in agreement with the statement by R. G. Kratz, an American researcher of the nineteenth century, that this author has conducted research in 1976.

In recent years, emphasis on the evaluation of teachers has become increasingly apparent not only in colleges, military training programs and high schools, but in elementary schools as well. According to Ryans (1960), researchers have taken basically five directions in attempting to evaluate teachers: evaluation by supervisors, by colleagues, by the teachers themselves (self-evaluation), by trained observers and by students. Of these approaches, evaluation by trained observers and by students have proven to be the most reliable. The present study is concerned with teacher evaluation by students.

When students evaluate teachers, it is logical to assume that their own characteristics may affect how they

view teachers and how they actually evaluate them. Research in the fields of education and psychology has focused on a multitude of student variables including among them student self esteem, student perception of his/her relationship with the teachers and student degree of acceptance of responsibility for his/her own actions. The existing literature supports the proposition that pairs of these factors are related to each other (Crandall et al., 1965; Davidson & Lang, 1960; Davis & Davis, 1972; Fitch, 1970; Pegg, 1970). However, no single study has attempted to investigate the possibility that all three factors are related. Certainly, no study has attempted to relate all of these factors to student evaluation of teacher performance. The present study investigates the possibility that student self esteem, student perception of his/her relationship with the teacher, and student acceptance of responsibility for his/her own actions are related to perceived teacher performance.

When considering the use of subjective criterion, such as evaluation of teacher competence on any level (supervisors, peers or students), the relationship of the subjective criterion with the objective criterion of learning and human development must be considered. Several studies (Medley & Mitzel, 1963; Rodin & Rodin, 1972; Stecklein, 1960) failed to find any appreciable relationship between teachers' ratings and student attainment, yet

others (Bryson, 1974; Morsh, Burgess & Smith, 1956) demonstrated significant correlation between student gains and their ratings of their instructors.

Although the above five studies indicate that there is some conflict as to the correlation of evaluation of teachers with student attainment, the research generally indicates that evaluation by students is superior to evaluation by supervisors or by peers (Morsh, Burgess & Smith, 1956; Ryans, 1960). There is also evidence to support the contention that evaluation of teachers by adult students is highly related to learning. Similar research with children is lacking, yet certain teacher qualities are commonly desired by adult, high school and elementary school students. For instance, knowledge of subject matter, rapport, understanding and fairness of teaching methods are desired by all previously mentioned age groups (Bryson, 1974; Ryans, 1960; Veldman & Peck, 1963; White & Dekle, 1966).

There is then reason to believe that student evaluation of teacher performance at the elementary school level would discriminate between those teachers who foster the cognitive development of their students and those who do not. In researching student characteristics which are believed to be involved in the evaluation of teachers and their relationship with perceived teacher performance at the sixth grade level, the following hypothesis was proposed:

There would be a high positive relationship between a composite of student psychological variables with a set of variables designed to measure student perception of teachers.

The student psychological variables were defined as:

- a) student self esteem as assessed by the Self Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967).
- b) student responsibility for positive and negative events as assessed by the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire (Crandall et al., 1965).
- c) student perception of his/her relationship with the teacher in terms of empathetic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard and congruence as assessed by the Relationship Inventory (Bills, 1975).

The variables designed to measure student perception of teachers were assessed by the Student Evaluation of Teacher II (SET II) (Haak et al., 1972). The variables were:

- a) interactional competence.
- b) rapport.

- c) unreasonable negativity.
- d) fosterance of self esteem.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

Student Evaluation of Teachers and Student Attainment

This is truly the age of accountability for education. With the number of trained teachers graduating each year and flooding the job market, administrators and tax-paying citizens can afford to be increasingly discriminative. Now, more than ever before, we need reliable and valid methods for identifying the best teachers. When considering the use of subjective criterion, such as evaluation of teacher competence on any level (supervisors, peers or students), we must know if the subjective criterion is related to the objective criterion of learning and human development.

Several studies (Medley & Mitzel, 1963; Rodin & Rodin, 1972; Stecklein, 1960) failed to find any appreciable relationship between teachers' ratings and student attainment. Rodin & Rodin (1972) reached this conclusion after comparing the ratings given to ten teaching assistants by 293 calculus students with the number of paradigm problems successfully completed by the students upon completion of the course. The professor in charge gave three

lectures per week and designed the test questions. Each teaching assistant spent one day each week with a group of students answering questions and one day each week administering the test problems and going over the results with the students. The students could take variants of each problem, up to six times if necessary, and the final grade was based solely upon the number of problems passed. The three teaching assistants rated lowest by their students instructed students with the highest grades. The teaching assistant rated highest instructed students who achieved the least. Because of the Rodins' methodology, Bryson (1974) criticized the applicability of their conclusion. The teaching assistants did not have full responsibility for teaching the course the way an instructor usually would. In direct conflict with the Rodins' study, Bryson found a significantly positive relationship between instructor characteristics and amount learned. Teaching skills of 14 college algebra instructors were evaluated by their 582 students. These instructors used the same textbook, were told what subject matter to cover, and did not see the final exam. However, method of presentation was left to their discretion.

Attempting to establish a reliable and valid method of instructor evaluation for the United States Air Force, Morsh, Burgess and Smith (1956) asked supervisors and colleagues to rank-order 40 instructors of the Hydraulics

Phase in the Aircraft Mechanic course at Sheppard Air Force Base in terms of their "general effectiveness." Students were asked to rate their instructors on knowledge of subject, teaching methods, understanding of students and as a personal friend, and then, to rank these four qualities in order of the instructor's relative strength in them. Morsh et al. found little relationship between supervisor and peer rankings and student gains. Yet, there was significant correlation between student gains and their ratings of their instructors.

Although there is some conflict as to the correlation of evaluation of teachers with student attainment, the research generally indicates that evaluation by students is superior to evaluation by supervisors or by peers. In fact, there is evidence to support the contention that evaluation of teachers by adult students is highly related to learning. Similar research with children is lacking, yet there is reason to believe that student evaluation of teacher performance at the elementary school level would discriminate between those teachers who foster the cognitive development of their students and those who do not. To justify this line of reasoning one must examine closely characteristics of children and their ability to perceive and describe their teachers' behavior.

Reliability and Validity of Student Evaluation of Teachers

In using the perceptions of children in assessing teacher characteristics, a concern must be the children's ability to discriminate, and the validity of their discriminations. In reference to discrimination, Amatora (1950) compared the ratings of seven teachers by 1,000 children in grades four through eight. She noted that children exhibited markedly different degrees of liking for three teachers and almost an equal degree of liking for the other four. She considered it significant that they were able to discriminate well enough to agree about four of the teachers. Using a TAT-like testing situation, Biber and Lewis (1949) found that children's perceptions did indeed reflect procedures which were carried out in school and that children did respond to individual differences among their teachers. Wright and Sherman (1965) explored the nature of those dimensions of teacher characteristics upon which children were found to most agree and most disagree. There was very little disagreement concerning teacher competence, but some disagreement concerning the teachers' affective feelings towards the students themselves. Later, on reanalyzing the questions to which the students responded, Haak et al. (1972) noticed that competence was represented in very concrete observable terms and that the "love" items were composed of removed, motivational terms. This bears implications for care which should be exercised

in wording affective questions. Still, when looking at the class as a whole, these affective questions were rather reliable, and they could have diagnostic implications for one student or a subgroup of a class. Neale and Proshek (1967) found that children in minority groups expressed favorable responses to some aspects of school which more middle class children did not view so favorably. Although in this case different preferences emerged from children of different socio-economic backgrounds, these children did indeed discriminate.

In general, it appears that children, even as early as fourth grade, are able to agree quite often about what is going on, especially when it comes to concretely defined observable overt behavior. Further support for their discriminative ability was supplied by Good and Grouws (1975) in a study on reliability of student evaluation of teachers. They administered the Halo Scale drawn from the My Class Inventory (Rabinowitz & Rosenbaum, 1958) plus two additional items about class discussion and peer relations to third and fourth graders in 75 classrooms in the Spring of two consecutive years. Stability of teacher ratings were evident over the two year period, especially with teachers at the extreme ends of the distribution.

It appears that children can reliably discriminate, but there has been little research regarding the validity of young students' opinions about their teachers. Indirect

support of validity was determined by Centra (1973), Gage, Runkel and Chatterjee (1963) and by Tuckman and Oliver (1968). In a study involving over 400 college faculty members, half of whom were assigned to an experimental group and half to a control group, Centra (1973) found that as a result of student ratings of instructor practices, changes in practices occurred after a half semester for instructors judged as "unrealistic." Furthermore, even more instructors changed if given more than a half semester. In a study involving 176 sixth grade teachers and their approximately 3,900 students, Gage et al. (1963) found that when student evaluations were made available to the teachers, as opposed to when they were not, teaching competence improved. Tuckman and Oliver (1968) administered the Student Opinion Questionnaire (Bryan, 1963) to the students of 286 high school vocational teachers. They found that teacher behavior which was negatively affected by feedback from supervisors conversely was positively improved by student feedback. In all of the above studies the teachers seemed to acknowledge the validity of student evaluations by their differential reaction to it.

The fact that children can discriminate is firmly established. Not only can they agree on a teacher's characteristics, but other children who are enrolled in that teacher's class the next year likewise perceive those characteristics and rate the teacher accordingly. Teacher

behavior seems to indicate that the children's opinions are of importance because teachers tend to modify and even improve their teaching methods after student evaluation feedback.

Teacher Characteristics Desired by Students

Much in-depth research has transpired since Kratz (1896) constructed a set of structured questions about teaching and administered it to 2,411 elementary and secondary school children. At that time children indicated preference for teachers who were encouraging, patient, polite, neat and pleasant.

Amatora (1950), using the Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale with 1,174 children, found that highly rated teachers were generally well-liked, seen as being good at explaining, and as being sympathetic and fair--particularly in grading. They were viewed as being able to maintain discipline, requiring work from students and teaching lessons which the children enjoyed.

Symonds (1963) combined a student nomination technique with his own subjective observations of classroom behavior of 17 teachers taken from the top and bottom of the students' nomination list. He concluded that the "superior" teachers liked children, were well-integrated with good personality organization and were personally secure and self-assured. The "inferior" teachers disliked

children, were personally disorganized and were insecure with feelings of inferiority and inadequacy.

Ryans (1960) classified 2,043 elementary and high school teachers on the basis of classroom behavior. On analysis of the data, he was able to construct the following three patterns of "good" versus "bad" teacher characteristics:

Pattern Xo: understanding, friendly vs. aloof, egocentric, restricted.

Pattern Yo: responsible, businesslike, systematic vs. evading, unplanned or slipshod.

Pattern Zo: stimulating, imaginative, surgent or enthusiastic vs. dull, routine.

Veldman and Peck (1963) administered the Pupil Observation Survey Report to seventh through twelfth grade students of 554 student teachers. A factor analysis identified five major dimensions within which the students located their teachers. The first three highly resembled Ryan's (1960) three patterns of observed teacher behavior. The five dimensions were:

- 1) friendly and cheerful.
- 2) knowledgeable and poised.
- 3) lively and interesting.
- 4) firm control (discipline).
- 5) non-directive (democratic procedure).

Barbe and Steiert (1964) asked gifted children in grades three through six to rate their teachers and found that they regarded the teachers along two dimensions. Of interest here is that gifted children are the only group of students which has been found to rate the qualities of knowledge and wisdom first. The two dimensions were:

- 1) knowledge and wisdom.
- 2) warmth.

White and Dekle (1966) administered the Pupil Observation Survey Report (Veldman & Peck, 1963) to students in grades five through seven. They divided the students into groups of over achievers, normal achievers and under-achievers. Upon factor analysis of the data, they found wide differences among these groups only in one factor--warm, affable, deferring. The six factors of teacher characteristics were:

- 1) warm, affable, deferring.
- 2) fair, considerate.
- 3) controlled, orderly.
- 4) surgent, stimulating.
- 5) knowledgeable, open-minded.
- 6) self-assured, poised, ego-strength.

Beck (1967) administered the About My Teacher assessment scale to 2,108 sixth graders and found the children describing their teachers along three dimensions:

- 1) warmth and friendliness.

2) ability to communicate clearly.

3) motivating qualities.

In summary, children seem to indicate preference for a warm and friendly teacher who likes them, a teacher who can control the class, provide some degree of structure and is knowledgeable. Furthermore, they want a teacher who is able to communicate that knowledge in an involving and interesting manner.

Student Characteristics

In asking whether or not student characteristics are related to their evaluation of teachers, certain student traits must be selected from the universe of student traits. Of particular emphasis in this study are student self esteem, student acceptance of responsibility for his/her own actions and student perception of his/her relationship with the teacher.

Self esteem. Self esteem is also referred to under the labels of self concept and phenomenal self. Snygg and Combs have defined it as the sum total of all of person's awarenesses and perceptions of himself, judged by himself (Fitts et al., 1971). Coopersmith (1967) called it an evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself. It's an attitude of approval or disapproval, an attitude which indicates the extent to which one feels capable, significant, successful and worthy.

In short, as Coopersmith (1967) states, "self esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (p. 5). Not only is self esteem resilient, but it does not change significantly for preadolescent children across different areas of experience such as school, family, peers, self and general social activities (Coopersmith, 1967). As he points out, either preadolescent children make little distinction about their worthiness in different areas, or such distinctions occur within the context of an over-all, general appraisal of worthiness.

A difference, although not a significant difference, in the self esteem of low socio-economic status children (SES) as compared to more advantaged children has been consistently noted. Trowbridge (1972) administered the Self Esteem Inventory (SEI) (Coopersmith, 1967) to 3,789 children in grades three through eight. They were of low and middle income, from urban and rural areas and of Black and "Other" racial heritage. Trowbridge found that a nonsignificant trend existed at all IQ levels in which the low SES children had higher self esteem than middle SES children. Age and sex factors were nonsignificant, and self esteem was generally positive in the middle SES group as well. McDaniel (1967), Scott (1969) and Soares and Soares (1969) obtained the same results without considering IQ. Zirkel and Moses (1971) administered the SEI to 120 students from

three schools who were similarly distributed as to sex, SES and IQ (range 76-112). Each school contained Negro, Puerto Rican and White children with each group being in majority at one school. The majority-minority, sex and IQ factors did not yield significant differences. Without reaching significant levels, Negro children had higher self esteem than White children, and White children had higher self esteem than Puerto Rican children.

Studies investigating the relationship of self esteem to achievement and IQ have yielded nonsignificant to moderately positive results. In a study using fourth and sixth graders from schools in Clarke County, Georgia, Bledsoe (1967) found that correlations between self concept and IQ as measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity were low to moderately positive for boys and nonsignificant for girls. Similar results were obtained for self concept and achievement using the California Achievement Tests.

Using the SEI, Coopersmith (1967) likewise found a low correlation between self concept and achievement. Using the SEI with fourth, fifth and sixth graders, Campbell (1967) also found a low correlation between self esteem and achievement as measured by the Iowa Composite Achievement Test scores, the relationship being higher for boys than for girls. Eubank (1962), however, using the Bills-Lipsitt Self Concept Scale and nationally standardized achievement and intelligence scales, found no

significant differences between the means of the intelligence and achievement tests for high and low self concept groups of fourth and sixth graders. Reeder's findings (Campbell, 1967) that children achieve lower in terms of their potential if they have a low self concept may account for the correlations with achievement which are usually higher than correlations with intelligence.

With such inconsistencies being obtained in the research on self esteem as it applies to measureable educational correlates, one may be prematurely drawn to the conclusion that measurement of student self esteem is a waste of time and effort. However, the use of student self esteem measurement in researching the area of student evaluation of teachers is supported by the research of Davidson and Lang (1960). They discovered that the student's perception of the teacher's feelings toward him or her correlates positively with self esteem. Furthermore, as children perceive their teacher's feelings to be more positive toward them, their academic achievement and classroom behavior are rated as higher and more desirable by their teachers.

In summary, significant differences in self esteem among children have not been found in the variables of sex, age, IQ, ethnic group or social status. Self esteem scores sometimes correlate on a low to moderate level with achievement. Students' perceptions of their teachers'

feelings towards them correlate positively with self esteem. Indeed, as children perceive their teachers' feelings toward them to be more positive, their teachers tend to rate more highly their academic achievement and classroom behavior.

Conditions of Relationship. The work of Carl Rogers in the area of interpersonal relationships led to a study by Barrett-Lennard (1962) and the development of the Relationship Inventory (RI) used to assess perceived client-therapist relationship. Rogers (1957 & 1959) theorized that certain conditions must be present for a productive, healthy working relationship between client and therapist. Barrett-Lennard used two of these variables in the RI--empathetic understanding (the extent to which one person recognizes perceptions or feelings of another) and congruence (consistency between awareness, communication and action). Barrett-Lennard also used the concept of unconditional positive regard, originally formulated by Standal (1954), and considered it to be the two separate conditions of level of regard (i.e., the positive or negative affective aspects of one person's responses to another) and unconditionality of regard (i.e., the degree of constancy of regard felt by one person for another who communicates his or her personal experiences to the first). Another condition, willingness to be known (i.e., the sharing of personal experiences and self perceptions, perceptions of

feelings toward the other and perception of the immediate relationship) was also formulated by Barrett-Lennard for the RI (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

The instrument developed by Barrett-Lennard and his associates measured the contribution of these conditions to the therapeutic relationship. Four conditions--empathetic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard and congruence--were positively correlated with indices of personality change during therapy. These conditions which served so well in defining the therapeutic relationship and produced positive change in the therapeutic relationship, cast implications for other relationships. They refer to broad attitudinal qualities that may be present or absent in any significant, continuing interpersonal relationship, especially of a helping relationship nature, (such as that between teacher and student) which would have a bearing on the psychological development and functioning of the individuals involved.

Such a course was pursued by Robert Bills (1975) in revising the Relationship Inventory so that it could be used with teachers and their students. Bills' research (1975) with a group of 6,929 students in grades seven through twelve indicated that students tend to see their teachers as being higher in positive regard and congruence than in empathetic understanding or unconditional regard. Male students felt that their teachers had lower levels of

regard, empathetic understanding, and congruence, and had more conditionality of regard than did female students. Among grade levels, there was no significant difference between unconditionality of regard and congruence scores. It was noted that as students proceed from grade to grade, they feel that their teachers are less highly regarding and less empathetic.

As demonstrated by Aspy (1967) and Aspy and Hadlock (1967), teachers' levels of empathy, congruence and positive regard have a significant influence on the cognitive growth of elementary school children. Aspy (1967) gave 120 third graders, matched according to sex and IQ (range 90-120), the five subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test at the beginning and conclusion of the same academic year. The teachers' levels of empathy, congruence and positive regard were determined from tape recordings by experienced raters employing previously validated scales. Students receiving significantly higher facilitative conditions achieved significantly higher gains on four of the five achievement subtests. The mean difference for total gain by the two groups was 1.6 years. Employing the same method with another set of elementary school children and their teachers, Aspy and Hadlock (1967) obtained similar results. The students of the highest rated teacher gained an average of 2.5 academic years, while the students of the lowest level teacher gained an average of .5 of an academic year.

It was also noted that students of the low level functioning teachers were significantly more truant than those of the high level functioning teachers.

The conditions of positive regard, empathetic understanding, unconditionality of regard and congruence as perceived by clients in psychotherapy have been shown to be instrumental to positive growth change (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). Likewise, the conditions of positive regard, empathetic understanding and congruence are significantly related to cognitive gain in elementary school students.

Student Responsibility. Investigators from diverse orientations have frequently shown their concern with man's ability to control his personal environment. Alfred Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956) is the theorist who has written the most about his concern for man's becoming more effective in controlling his personal world. Sharing this concern, Richter (1959) and Mowrer and Vieck (1948) conducted animal studies which have shown that animals react differentially to painful stimuli according to availability of personal control over the situation. When the animals controlled their environment to avoid the stimuli, there was often no detrimental behavioral change, but when they were strictly at the mercy of their environment, many died.

Heider (1958) formulated his causal attribution theory to describe the cognitive process people use in structuring their environment. According to Heider, a person

engaged in an activity attributes its outcome to one or more internal or external causal sources. The construct, internal-external control per se, was developed from Rotter's (1954) social learning theory. According to Rotter, internal control refers to attributing to oneself responsibility for the consequences of one's own actions. External control refers to attributing to forces outside of the self (fate, chance or powerful others) the responsibility for the consequences of one's own actions. Locus of control is viewed as a generalized expectancy which operates across situations.

Many situations contain cues which help define the degree to which events are contingent upon an individual's actions. Individuals differ in the degree to which they believe they can usually influence outcomes. The original questionnaire constructed to assess this variable of internal versus external control in adults was developed by Phares (1957), later revised by James (1957), and then by Liverant, Rotter, Crowne and Seeman (Gore & Rotter, 1963). More recently, three other instruments have been developed for children: the Locus of Control Scale, by Bialer (1961); the Children's Picture Test of Internal-External Control, by Battle and Rotter (1963), and the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire, by Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall (1965).

There has been agreement among researchers and theorists in the past, namely Keister (1937) and Lewin (1935), that the child must be able to see himself as an instrument in the outcome of events in order to have a subjective experience of success or failure. Bialer (1961) therefore, set out to construct a tentative formulation of success-failure conceptualization measured by developmentally determined patterns in retarded and normal children and to investigate the possibility that conceptual maturity might exist as an age-independent factor. As Bialer explains, there is no conception of a relationship between the outcome of events and one's own behavior in the early stages of development. Events are simply categorized as pleasant or unpleasant without regard to personal responsibility for them. As the child develops, the child begins to realize that she or he can often influence the outcome of events. According to the child's ability, favorable outcomes which he or she causes may be seen as pleasureable or even as successes. Likewise, the child may see unfavorable outcomes as unpleasant or even as failures. The younger child's motivation is based upon hedonistic cues, while with the development of conceptual maturity and internal control, the child responds to cues associated with personal success or failure. Both systems operate in the more mature child and may be in conflict, such as when he or she must endure unpleasantness to achieve the desired goal or

when an event which is pleasureable is associated with failure. The child is increasingly faced with the phenomenon of delayed gratification.

Using a sample of 89 mentally retarded and normal children of both sexes, ranging in chronological age from 6-3 to 14-3 and in mental age from 3-10 to 15-9, Bialer (1961) found that with increasing age (regardless of retarded-normal classification, there was a significant tendency to perceive internal locus of control and to respond to success-failure cues rather than to hedonistic cues, and so to delay gratification. Mental age, rather than chronological age carried no weight when effects of mental age were partialled out. Therefore, retarded children apparently do not qualitatively differ from normal children in developing the ability to conceptualize success and failure, but since the conceptualization develops more slowly, retarded children are chronologically older than their counterparts at any given level of conceptual development.

Therefore, if the patterns of internal-external responses of classrooms of retarded children are compared with those of classrooms of normal children of approximately the same age, one would expect a more external pattern in the classrooms of retarded children. Furthermore, the respective classrooms might have noticeably different patterns of evaluation of teacher performance. The task would then be to ascertain whether the differences were due to

characteristics of the teachers themselves, differential modes of relating to retarded and normal children, or the different levels of conceptual development of the two groups of children.

Both Pegg (1970) and Fitch (1970) found external control to be positively related to self esteem. Fitch identified high and low self esteem subjects using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1964). After placing his 135 undergraduate business students in success and failure conditions of high and low choice, he found that high-esteem subjects tended to internalize success outcomes but not failure outcomes. Low-esteem subjects tended to internalize both success and failure. Fitch felt that the tendency to internalize failure more might be a causal factor operating in low self esteem. In basic agreement with Fitch, Davis and Davis (1972) in a study involving internal and external college students and their reactions to success and failure feedback on task anagrams or a "social sensitivity test" found that the groups did not differ in taking personal credit for success. However, internals showed a greater tendency to blame themselves for failure than did externals. Davis and Davis hypothesized that external locus of control might serve a defense function. Further, these studies seem to lend support to the idea that internal locus of control may be correlated

with low self esteem, whereas external locus of control may be correlated with high self esteem.

In studying locus of control and achievement, McGhee and Crandall (1968) administered the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire (IAR) (Crandall et al., 1965) to third, seventh and tenth graders in partial replication of an earlier study (Crandall et al., 1965). Children in both studies who were more highly internal on either the IAR subscore or the total test score consistently attained higher academic performance scores in both achievement tests and grades.

In summary, the research on student responsibility has shown that children begin developing a sense of responsibility for the results of their own actions at an early age. Even as early as the third grade, internal control has been consistently related to achievement in children. There seems to be some interaction between development of locus of control and self esteem because college students with high self esteem tend to take personal credit for success but not for failure, whereas college students with comparatively lower self esteem tend to take both the credit for success and the blame for failure.

Summary of the Literature Review

The past research indicates that children can discriminate between teachers who foster their cognitive

development and those who do not. Students of all ages seem to hold common preference for the ideal teacher, and children specifically want a warm, friendly teacher who is knowledgeable, can communicate that knowledge in an involving and interesting manner, who likes them and can control the class providing some degree of structure. Their evaluations spur positive change in teacher behavior as opposed to the evaluations by supervisors or peers.

Self esteem of children does not change significantly over a wide range of experiences, nor does it differ significantly across sex, IQ, SES or ethnic heritage. Still, there is a trend of low SES students having higher self esteem than others, Black children scoring higher than Caucasians and Caucasians scoring higher than Puerto Rican children. The general tendency for the great majority of children is toward positive self esteem. Self esteem does show a low to moderate correlation with achievement. It is important to note that self esteem does correlate positively with students' perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them, and the more positive the perceived relationship, the more highly their teachers rate their academic achievement and classroom behavior.

In studies with children, high self esteem does sometimes show a low to moderate correlation with achievement, and internal locus of control as early as the third grade has consistently been related to achievement. It seems

inconsistent then that in a study with college students, external locus of control was related to high self esteem. It could be that at all ages self reported high self esteem is related somewhat to achievement and that locus of control is more strongly related to achievement. At first, internal locus of control is strongly related to achievement, but as people mature and approach adulthood, external locus of control becomes highly related to achievement. It has been suggested that external locus of control really serves as a defense mechanism. It could be that a larger proportion of the more mature population utilizes external control in meeting their needs and in upholding their self concepts.

Positive regard, empathetic understanding, unconditionality of regard and congruence perceived in a relationship facilitates positive change. Additionally, positive regard, empathetic understanding and congruence have been shown to relate significantly to cognitive gain in elementary school students. The past research indicates that the affective states of children play an important role in their school experience. They tend to value their teachers more highly if they too manifest emotions such as warmth and friendliness. They very much want their teachers to be interested in them not just as academic performers, but as whole persons. In reality education is concerned with more than just cognitive development. Throughout the years of

schooling children are learning how to handle their own personal characteristics, their own emotions and their relationships with other people. As key figures in the lives of children, teachers contribute to their affective development through personal contact and by example. Teacher competence then includes a combination of knowledge, effective teaching skills, and the communication of emotions and attitudes felt by the teacher which are connected with the students as individuals. The goal of the present study is to further clarify the relationship between student psychological variables (self esteem, perception of his/her relationship with the teacher and degree of acceptance of responsibility for his/her own actions) and perceived teacher characteristics (interactional competence, rapport, unreasonable negativity and fosterance of self esteem).

CHAPTER III

Method

Subjects

The subjects for this study were chosen because the teachers and their principals responded affirmatively to requests to participate. The subjects were 266 sixth graders and their teachers from 10 classrooms in South Central Kentucky. The participants included eight public-rural classrooms, one experimental-city classroom and one parochial-city classroom. The students' reading abilities ranged from poor to excellent. Therefore, the procedure was adjusted for the two classrooms of poor readers where all questions were read aloud. The teachers were all female, nine being White and one being Black. Nine of the ten reported that their educational levels ranged from bachelor to doctoral-equivalent levels, four reporting BA levels, three reporting MA-equivalent levels and one reporting a doctoral-equivalent level. Years of teaching experience ranged from 7 to 34 years. (See Appendix A for more explicit demographic information.)

Instruments

Self Esteem Inventory (SEI). This instrument yields a subjective interpretation of the student's self esteem defined as "a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 5). The SEI was developed using fifth and sixth grade children, ages ten through twelve, and the final form was likewise administered to such a sample of 1,748 children of both sexes. Test-retest reliability is .70. The mean reliability for males is .701 with a standard deviation of 13.8. The mean reliability for females is .722 with a standard deviation of 12.8.

The SEI is relatively free from many common variables. There was only a weak relationship ($p < .15$) between self esteem and social class. There were no significant differences between males and females or children of Jewish, Roman Catholic or Protestant faiths. Correlation between self esteem and intelligence was only .28 ($p < .05$) and between self esteem and achievement was .30 ($p < .05$) (Coopersmith, 1967).

The SEI consists of 58 items which are short statements requiring an answer of "like me" or "unlike me." The answer is made by placing a check in the appropriate column.

Relationship Inventory (RI). The original RI (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) was revised by Robert Bills (1975)

to determine the quality of a child's perceived relationship with his or her teacher in terms of empathetic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard and congruence. Empathetic understanding describes a relationship in which the student feels that the teacher understands what it is like to be a student. Level of regard describes a relationship in which the student feels that the teacher acts as if he or she believes that the student is an important person. In unconditionality of regard, the student believes that the teacher is not placing a "price" on his positive regard. In congruence, the student believes that the teacher is thinking and feeling in accordance with his or her behavior. The teacher does not give the impression of thinking one way and behaving another.

The intercorrelations of the four RI scales based on a sample of 2,691 seventh through twelfth graders are low, the most independent being unconditionality of regard. Empathetic understanding, level of regard and congruence have considerable independence, yet the amount of existing overlap suggests that these variables are often present in the same person to the same degree.

Coefficients of internal consistency (split-half correlations) are lower than might be hoped, yet, according to Bills (1975), they are surprisingly high for scales containing only eighteen items each. The corrected split-half correlations are: Level of Regard, .79, Empathetic

Understanding, .73, Unconditionality of Regard, .58, Congruence, .58 and Total Scale, .89.

The majority of the items add to the reliability of the total scale. The items do show higher correlations with the total scores of the scales in which they are contained, the size of the coefficients being such that it may be concluded that most items have excellent reliabilities.

The RI is composed of 72 simple statements scored either positively or negatively as to the four scales, yielding a score for each scale. The answer is made by marking out a number in each statement according to how strongly the subject feels. There is a range of six choices from "Strongly Yes" to "Strongly No."

Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire

(IAR). This instrument developed by Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall (1965) is the first children's questionnaire aimed at assessing children's beliefs in reinforcement responsibility exclusively in intellectual-academic achievement situations. It is also the first to score internal responses for both positive and negative events.

The IAR developmental sample included 923 students in the third through twelfth grades of both sexes with 166 sixth graders being included. Test-retest reliabilities for younger children, including sixth graders, are .65 for Total I (internal control for all events), .47 for I+ (in-

ternal control for positive events) and .69 for I- (internal control for negative events) ($p < .001$). There are no significant sex differences. Internal consistency is .60 for I+ and I-. For sixth graders, the correlation of subscale scores (I+ and I-) is .38 ($p < .001$) (Crandall et al., 1965).

The questionnaire is relatively free from the influence of several well-known variables. Correlations with social class are only .11 for I ($p < .05$), .04 for I+ and .14 for I- ($p < .01$). However, girls do give significantly more internal responses than boys, particularly in taking responsibility for negative events.

The IAR consists of 34 forced choice items describing positive and negative achievement experiences routinely occurring in children's daily lives. Items are worded simply, clearly and only require marking the desired response.

Student Evaluation of Teacher II (SET II). The SET II, developed by Haak, Kleiber and Peck (1972), is designed for use with children in grades one through six. It contains four factors upon which children in grades four through six make their evaluations of teachers. These factors are interactional competence, rapport, unreasonable negativity and fosterance of self esteem.

Because of the true-false format, reliability for the SET II was determined using percentage of agreement statistics. For example, 152 Mexican-American children formed

the developmental sample for grades four through six. They were administered the SET II in April, 1971, and then again ten days later. Percentage of Agreement for the items ranged from 66.1 to 94.0. Percentage of Agreement by ability level for these children yielded similar results. All reliabilities for all items were considered to be adequate by the authors of the SET II.

On factor analysis of the data, differences between cultural groups and grade appeared at a slight level among first grade children but tended to disappear by the time the sample group reached the third grade--Blacks, Mexican Americans and Whites were included in the developmental sample for grades one through three. These differences were that Black children were more cohesive in their evaluations of their teachers' attitudes toward themselves than they were in their own evaluations of their teachers. Mexican-American children were more cohesive in their evaluation of emotionally laden items.

For the children in grades four through six, four separate factors were determined: interactional competence, rapport, unreasonable negativity and fosterance of self esteem.

Interactional competence, Factor I, concerns the success with which the teacher communicates and interacts with the class. The items touch upon teacher-student communication, appropriate aid where "gaps" exist and appearance of

deriving personal satisfaction from teaching. These items are similar to those in Factor II except that they are less emotional and evaluative and more competency based.

Rapport, Factor II, concerns the teacher and students being engaged in a pleasant, stimulating relationship where the teacher expects a certain degree of understanding from the children. It reflects a "generous, non-egocentric view of children" by the teacher.

Unreasonable negativity, Factor III, concerns unreasonable, excessive emotional negativity in teacher behavior. A teacher scoring high on this factor explodes and punishes, much to the confusion of the students.

Fosterance of self esteem, Factor IV, is composed of items which relate to a child's personal competence and self esteem. It reflects a relationship between the child's observation of teacher behavior and what the child feels is his teacher's evaluation of his own intelligence and competence.

The SET II consists of 23 simply worded, short statements. The subject responds by marking them true or false.

Procedure

Administration. The instruments were administered to the children by a psychology professor and three psychology graduate students in April, 1976. The testing for each class was conducted on two successive days with another day

of testing scheduled for students who missed one or both sessions. Except for the second session of testing in the parochial school, all testing took place in the morning hours. During the testing sessions the teachers were absent from the room to ensure the confidentiality of the students' responses.

On the first day of testing the SEI and IAR were administered in that order. On the second day of testing the SET II and the RI were administered respectively. The reason for this ordering was to minimize the possible effects of fatigue and frustration. The 58 item SEI required less reading than the 34 item IAR which has two written responses to be considered in answering each question. By administering the SEI first, there was a decreased possibility of a fatigue factor affecting the subjects' responses than if the IAR was first administered. The same rationale was applied to the administration of the 23 item SET II and the 72 item RI. The RI, with its likert scale answers, was the longest and most difficult instrument, so it seemed reasonable to pair it with the easiest instrument, the SET II. The reason the SET II and RI were administered on the second day was to minimize the influence of any frustration arising from taking the most difficult instrument.

On the first day of testing each teacher was given a pre-coded personal data form requesting the following

information: name of school, subject(s) taught, teacher's educational level, institution from which the teacher graduated, years of teaching experience, teacher's sex and the teacher's ethnic group. The teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they desired feedback from this study and were asked to return the form to the test administrator.

Each test administrator was briefed prior to the testing dates. All test administrators were supplied with cards containing identification codes for each student in each classroom, pre-coded personal data forms for the teachers, pencils, answer sheets which contained a teacher code for each class, and a copy of directions to follow. They were verbally instructed to use as an example the first question of each instrument. (The directions provided appear in Appendix B.)

There were two classrooms entirely composed of poor readers. All questions were read to those students, and numerous definitions and examples were given in response to the children's questions.

Scoring. Scoring for the SEI, RI and IAR was executed in the manner prescribed by their authors so that higher scores represented higher ratings. Scoring for the interactional competence, rapport and fosterance of self esteem scales of the SET II were reversed so that higher scores would indicate higher ratings of those factors. The scoring for the unreasonable negativity scale of the SET II

remained unchanged since the originally prescribed scoring system indicated higher unreasonable negativity with higher scores. Therefore, for all scales used in this study, the same interpretive concept was used: as scores rise, so do scale ratings. (The possible range of scores are reported in Appendix C.)

CHAPTER IV

Results

Canonical correlation was conducted between two sets of variables obtained from all ten classrooms, $N = 266$. The first set was composed of the various student psychological variables--internal locus of control for positive and negative events as assessed by the IAR; self esteem as assessed by the SEI; and level of regard, empathetic understanding, unconditionality of regard and congruence as assessed by the RI. The second set was composed of the student perceptions of their teachers--interactional competence, fosterance of self esteem, rapport and unreasonable negativity as assessed by the SET II.

The canonical correlation yielded a significant relationship while accounting for 42% of the variance, $R_c(24) = .65$, $p < .001$. This means that the two composites share in common 42% of the variance. As indicated by the factor regression weights reported in Table I, three factors in each set contributed highly to the prediction of the scores in the other set. Level of regard, self esteem and empathetic understanding in that order accounted for most of the variance in the prediction of student

perception of their teachers. Level of regard is a great deal more highly weighted in the prediction than empathetic understanding, however, as can be seen in the canonical correlation matrix in Table II, the two are highly related, $r = .73$, and correlate similarly with interactional competence, rapport and unreasonable negativity in set two--the student perception of teacher variables. The regression weights are very different because level of regard and empathetic understanding are highly related, and once level of regard is partialled out, empathetic understanding is weighted with the remaining different behavioral responses in prediction of set two. Fostering of self esteem, rapport and unreasonable negativity accounted for most of the variance in the prediction of set one, the student psychological variables. Among the two sets of variables, internal locus of control for positive and negative events, unconditionality of regard, congruence and interactional competence carried little weight in prediction. For more detailed description of the relative significance of the variables in the two composites and correlations between factors, please refer to Table I and Table II below.

In an attempt to control for the possible confounding variable of reading level, canonical analyses were conducted separately for the two classrooms of poor readers ($N = 52$) and the eight classrooms of adequate readers ($N = 214$).

Table I

Factor Regression Weights for the Two Sets of Variables

Set one--student psychological variables

*Level of Regard	- 0.73057
*Self Esteem	- 0.34455
*Empathetic Understanding	- 0.14185
Internal Control	- 0.03839
Unconditionality of Regard	- 0.03606
Congruence	0.06395

Set two--student perception of teacher variables

*Fosterance of Self Esteem	- 0.44644
*Unreasonable Negativity	0.40610
*Rapport	- 0.32195
Interactional Competence	- 0.13681

Table II

Correlation Matrix of Variables in Set One and Set Two

	Internal Control	Self Esteem	Level of Regard	Empathetic Understanding	Unconditionality of Regard	Congruence	Interactional Competence	Fostering of Self Esteem	Rapport	Unreasonable Negativity
Internal Control	1.00000	0.26393	0.18675	0.16180	0.02028	0.06491	0.10857	0.14480	0.20900	- 0.09190
Self Esteem	0.26393	1.00000	0.27372	0.21250	0.05017	0.08114	0.16795	0.35023	0.32806	- 0.22798
Level of Regard	0.18675	0.27372	1.00000	0.73356	0.23938	0.19661	0.39979	0.50395	0.50044	- 0.39591
Empathetic Understanding	0.16180	0.21250	0.73356	1.00000	0.29718	0.18187	0.37409	0.33878	0.42073	- 0.36983
Unconditionality of Regard	0.02028	0.05017	0.23938	0.29718	1.00000	0.14267	0.05980	0.11692	0.09290	- 0.19407
Congruence	0.06491	0.08114	0.19661	0.18187	0.14267	1.00000	0.09045	0.14368	0.06463	0.01546
Interactional Competence	0.10857	0.16795	0.39979	0.37409	0.05980	0.09045	1.00000	0.51100	0.59676	- 0.16804
Fostering of Self Esteem	0.14480	0.35023	0.50395	0.33878	0.11692	0.14368	0.51100	1.00000	0.64303	- 0.26960
Rapport	0.20900	0.32086	0.50044	0.42073	0.09290	0.06463	0.59676	0.64303	1.00000	- 0.37147
Unreasonable Negativity	- 0.09190	- 0.22798	- 0.39591	- 0.36983	- 0.19407	0.01546	- 0.16804	- 0.26960	- 0.37147	1.00000

These results were similar to the over-all canonical analysis. Again, the same variables accounted for most of the variance. Accounting for 45% of the variance, results for the two classrooms of poor readers were $\underline{R}_c(24) = .67$, $p < .04$. Accounting for 43% of the variance, results for the eight classrooms of adequate readers were $\underline{R}_c(24) = .66$, $p < .01$. As illustrated by the similar canonical correlations and percentage of variance accounted for, the basic pattern of responding holds for both poor and adequate readers.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Implications

The findings of the present study indicate that the more highly sixth graders regard their own worthiness, perceive that their teachers believe them to be important people, and perceive that their teachers understand what it is like to be a student, the more favorably will they perceive their teachers. The children will tend to rate their teachers higher on their ability to engage in a pleasant, stimulating relationship in which the teacher expects a certain degree of understanding from the children and to rate their teachers higher on their ability to foster the children's sense of intelligence, personal competence and self worth. The children will consider their teachers to be more reasonable rather than exploding and punishing.

The results of the present study directly support the conclusion by Davidson and Lang (1960) that students' perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them correlate positively with student self esteem. Furthermore, the results of the present study indicate that student self esteem and teacher fosterance of self esteem are highly predictive of each other. It cannot be concluded from this

type of study if student self esteem is affected by the teacher's fosterance of self esteem or if there is an interaction affecting both.

Aspy (1967) and Aspy and Hadlock (1967) demonstrated from observer ratings and achievement test scores that teachers' positive regard, empathetic understanding and congruence significantly affected academic achievement, often dramatically. Although in the present study congruence is not a major factor, it is important to note that level of regard and empathetic understanding are major factors in the prediction of student perception of teachers. This indicates that children not only respond positively to high levels of affective facilitation in the academic domain, but that they themselves attach importance to empathetic understanding and level of regard. The fact that they are so highly valued by the students may be a causative factor in the results of the prior studies (Aspy, 1967; Aspy & Hadlock, 1967). The findings of the present study lend further support to the idea that the affective development of children is an important part of the educational process.

Several researchers (Barbe & Steiert, 1964; Beck, 1967; Veldman & Peck, 1963; White & Dekle, 1966) found that children highly value warmth and friendliness in their teachers. The strong negative influence of unreasonable negativity and strong positive influence of rapport found

in the present study lends further support to their findings.

Of particular interest is the fact that level of regard contributed highly to student perception of teachers, whereas unconditionality of regard did not. First of all it indicates that student perception of teachers is more complex than the notion "if you like me, then I will like you." It indicates that students seem to desire a contingency relationship. The exact nature of such contingencies are unknown. These findings could reflect a desire for some structure in the classroom and/or a self actualizing motivation within the students as individuals. They are striving to change, grow and improve their skills affectively and academically. They may want feedback from their teachers which tells them just how well they are doing rather than acceptance no matter what, which tells them nothing about themselves. These results could also be interpreted in behavior modification terms. Unconditional acceptance rapidly becomes non-rewarding.

Implications

Sixth graders of varying degrees of academic ability exhibit the same pattern of evaluating their teachers. Their own self esteem, perception of their teachers' level of regard and empathetic understanding strongly influence their evaluation of their teachers' rapport, fosterance of self esteem and reasonableness which have previously been

described (Haak et al., 1972) as factors of teacher competence. Thus, the message to teachers seems clear. Students want them to understand how it is to be a student, to show them that they are important individuals, to relate to them in a friendly and stimulating manner, to expect a certain degree of understanding from them and to foster their sense of intelligence and personal competence. This message comes from rural, small town and small city children, but this author believes that these desires are generally human desires and that future research, if conducted, will reveal similar patterns from urban and inner city children as well.

The findings of the present study justify further research of student psychological variables, student perception of their teachers and teacher behavior in the classroom. Analysis of patterns of student perception of their teachers needs to be carried out at the individual classroom level. The use of many more classrooms representative of children from more varied backgrounds may prove valuable. Also, in conjunction with such analysis it is important to find what those teachers actually do in the classrooms via trained teacher observer techniques. Utilizing the results of such further studies, an intensive program in teacher preparation training and human interaction training which concentrates on the affective needs of students as documented by the present study and knowledge

gained in future research could be offered to student teachers, teachers and principals. In this way teacher skills may be improved, the general school atmosphere may be improved by understanding administrators, and children will be given more space to grow and hopefully, enhanced motivation to learn and not to become mental or physical dropouts from "compulsary" education.

In concern for the future, this author also wishes to state that student perception of teachers may possibly go beyond the scope of this study. Student perception of teachers may in actuality be a reflection of student perception of self in relation to that Institution. If this is shown to be true, there will indeed be justification for re-evaluation of and adjustive changes in the present system.

References

- Amatora, S. M. A diagnostic teacher-rating scale. Journal of Psychology, 1950, 30, 395-399.
- Ansbacher, H., & Ansbacher, R. The individual psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, 1956.
- Aspy, D. N. The differential effects of high and low functioning teachers upon student achievement. In Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967, 296-297.
(Abstract)
- Aspy, D. N., & Hadlock, W. The effects of high and low functioning teachers upon student performance. In Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967, 297. (Abstract)
- Barbe, W., & Steiert, K. What children like about their teacher. Childhood Education, 1964, 40, 463-464.
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist responses as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 43, 1-33.
- Battle, E. S., & Rotter, J. B. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31(4), 482-490.
- Beck, W. R. Pupils' perceptions of teacher merit: a factor

- analysis of five postulated dimensions. Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 61(3), 127-128.
- Bialer, I. Conceptualization of success and failure in mentally retarded and normal children. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 303-320.
- Biber, B. & Lewis, C. An experimental study of what young children expect from their teachers. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1949, 40, 3-97.
- Bills, R. E. A system for assessing affectivity. University: University of Alabama Press, 1975.
- Bledsoe, J. C. Self concepts of children and their intelligence, achievement, interests, and anxiety. Childhood Education, 1967, 43, 436-438.
- Bryan, R. C. Reactions to teachers by students, parents, and administrators. United States Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 668. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1963.
- Bryson, R. Teacher evaluation and student learning: a re-examination. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 68(1), 12-14.
- Campbell, P. School and self concept. Educational Leadership, 1967, 24, 510-515.
- Centra, J. A. The student as godfather? The impact of student ratings on academia. Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on Faculty Effectiveness as Measured by Students. Philadelphia, Penn.: Temple

- University, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 079 338)
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1967.
- Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V. J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.
- Davidson, H. H., & Lang, G. Children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them related to self-perception, school achievement, and behavior. Journal of Experimental Education, 1960, 29, 107-118.
- Davis, W. L., & Davis, E. D. Internal-external control and attribution of responsibility for success and failure. Journal of Personality, 1972, 40, 121-136.
- Eubank, G. J. A comparative study of elementary pupils whose self-concepts are markedly contrary to expectation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1962.
- Fitch, G. Effects of self esteem, perceived performance and choice on causal attributes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16(2), 311-315.
- Fitts, W. H. Tennessee (Department of Mental Health) Self-Concept Scale. Nashville: Counselors Recordings & Tests, 1964.
- Fitts, W. H., Adams, J. L., Radford, G., Richard, W. C.,

- Thomas, B. K., Murphy, T. M., & Thompson, W. The self concept and self actualization. Nashville: Dede Wallace Center, 1971.
- Gage, N. L., Runkel, P. J., & Chatterjee, B. B. Changing teacher behavior through feedback from students: an application of equilibrium theory. In W. W. Charters and N. L. Gage (Eds.), Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1963.
- Good, T. L., & Grouws, D. A. Teacher rapport: some stability data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67(2), 179-182.
- Gore, M. P., & Rotter, J. B. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 58-64.
- Haak, R. A., Kleiber, D. A., & Peck, R. F. Student evaluation of teacher instrument manual II. University of Texas at Austin, 1972.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- James, W. H. Internal vs. External control of reinforcement as a basic variable in learning theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957.
- Keister, M. E. The behavior of young children in failure: an experimental attempt to discover and to modify undesirable responses of preschool children to failure. Iowa University Studies in Child Welfare, 1937, 14, 27-82.

- Kratz, R. G. Characteristics of the best teacher as recognized by children. *Pedagogical Seminary*, 1896, 3, 413-418.
- Lewin, K. A dynamic theory of personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.
- McDaniel, E. L. Relationships between self concept and specific variables in a low-income culturally different population. Final Report of Head Start Evaluation and Research to the Institute for Educational Development, Section VIII, August 31, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 019 124)
- McGhee, P. E., & Crandall, V. C. Beliefs in internal-external control of reinforcement and academic performance. Child Development, 1968, 39, 91-102.
- Medley, D., & Mitzel, H. Measuring classroom behavior by systematic observation. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Morsh, J. E., Burgess, G. G., & Smith, P. N. Student achievement as a measure of instructor effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 79-88.
- Mowrer, O. H., & Vieck, P. An experimental analogue of fear from a sense of helplessness. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 193-200.
- Neale, D. C., & Proshek, J. M. School-related attitudes of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 58(4), 238-244.

- Pegg, J. L. The personality integration of early adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College, 1970.
- Phares, E. J. Expectancy changes in skill and chance situations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 339-342.
- Rabinowitz, W., & Rosenbaum, I. A failure in the prediction of pupil-teacher rapport. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49(2), 1958.
- Richter, C. F. Sudden death phenomenon in animals and humans. In H. Feifel (Ed.), The meaning of death. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Rodin, M. & Rodin, B. Student evaluations of teachers. Science, 1972, 117, 1164-1166.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C. R. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: a study of science. Vol. 3. Formulations of the person and social context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Rotter, J. B. Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers: their description, comparison, and appraisal. Washington, D. C.:

- American Council on Education, 1960.
- Scott, L. J. An analysis of the self concept of seventh grade students in segregated-desegregated schools of Oklahoma City. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.
- Soares, A. T., & Soares, L. M. Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 31-45.
- Standal, S. W. The need for positive regard: a contribution to client-centered theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954.
- Stecklein, J. E. Colleges and universities. In C. H. Harris (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
- Symonds, P. M. Characteristics of the effective teacher based on pupil evaluations. Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 346-355.
- Trowbridge, N. Self concept and socio-economic status in elementary school children. American Educational Research Journal, 1972, 9(3), 525-537.
- Tuckman, B. W., & Oliver, W. F. Effectiveness of feedback to teachers as a function of source. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59(4), 297-301.
- Veldman, D. J., & Peck, R. F. Student teacher characteristics from pupils' viewpoint. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 346-355.

- White, W. F., & Dekle, O. T. Effects of teacher motivational cues on achievement levels in elementary grades. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 351-356.
- Wright, B., & Sherman, B. Love and mastery in the child's image of the teacher. The School Review, 1965, 73, 89-101.
- Zirkel, P. A., & Moses, E. G. Self concept and ethnic group membership among public school students. American Educational Research Journal, 1971, 8(2), 253-265.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER AND SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Educational Level</u>	<u>Years of Experience</u>
A	public-rural	White	MA/BA+30	10
B	public-rural	White	BA	8
C	public-rural	Black	BA	?
D	public-rural	White	BA	33
E	public-rural	White	BA	34
F	public-rural	White	?	13
G	public-rural	White	BA	18
H	public-rural	White	MA/BA+30	7
I	experimental-city	White	Ed.S/BA+60	15
J	parochial-city	White	MA/BA+30	18

APPENDIX B

DIRECTIONS TO TEST ADMINISTRATORS

Give the Data Form to the teacher and get it back before we leave today.

Day I

Pass out the cards to the children.

Pass out the SEI. While this is being passed out, write an example on the board.

1.	Like Me	Unlike Me
1. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.	_____	_____

Directions:

Write your number and sex on the answer sheet. Please answer the following sentences. If the sentence describes how you usually feel, put a check in the column "Like Me." If the sentence does not describe how you usually feel, put a check in the column "Unlike Me." There are no right or wrong answers. When you are through, bring your answers to me and return to your seat.

(Answer all questions. Watch for poor readers who are struggling along at a "snail's pace." You may want to read them each question. If there seems to be a number of slow readers, go ahead and read the questions aloud for the whole class.) When the majority of the children are finished, check to see how far the remainder has gotten. Go on to the next test within 25 minutes. They can keep the SEI at their desks.

Pass out the IAR. While this is being passed out, write an example on the board.

XX

a. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

b. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Directions:

Write your number and sex on the answer sheet. Place a check beside the statement you most agree with. Your teacher will not see your answers. Bring your answers to me when you are through.

(If a number of slow readers has been identified, read this aloud. If not, answer all questions. Offer help to anyone who seems to be going extra slowly. Before you leave, announce for them to keep the card to use tomorrow. Check to see that you have received all tests before you leave.

Day II

Pass out the SET II.

Pass out pencils.

Write an example on the board.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Directions:

Write your number and blacken the space for your sex. Do you really notice how your teacher acts? Please mark the following sentences about your teacher. Tell if each sentence is true or false by blackening the space next to the sentence. Be honest, and give your opinion. Your teacher will not see your answers. Please choose only one answer for each question. When you are through, bring your answers to me and return to your seat.

(Use what you learned yesterday about the kids in administering the instrument and controlling the kids.)

Pass out the RI and RI answer sheets. While this is being done, write an example on the board.

1. XXX

Strongly		Probably		Probably		Strongly
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
+++	++	+	-	--	---	---
3	2	1	1	2	3	

Directions:

Turn to the last page of the text with the numbers all over it. Write your name and sex.

Here is a list of some ways that a person may feel or act toward another person. Please think carefully about your relationship with your teacher when answering these statements. Look at your answer sheet. On your answer sheet, blacken out a number in each statement according to how strongly you feel that it is true or not true about your relationship with your teacher. You have the choice of answering strongly yes, yes, probably yes, probably no, no or strongly no. Your teacher will not see your answers.

Make sure you have received all tests before your leave.

APPENDIX C

Range of Possible Scores on All Scales

SEI	0 to 100
RI	
Empathetic Understanding	-54 to +54
Level of Regard	-54 to +54
Unconditionality of Regard	-54 to +54
Congruence	-54 to +54
IAR	
SET II	
Interactional Competence	0 to 8
Rapport	0 to 10
Unreasonable Negativity	0 to 10
Fosterance of Self Esteem	0 to 12